

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 5-9. These sheets, which include Figs. 3-9, replace the original sheets including Figs. 3-9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (3)

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 9-12, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25-27, and 29 are amended.

In the Office Action the drawings are objected to; the disclosure is objected to because of informalities; Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-17, 19, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Kawai; Claims 4, 7, 8, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Kawai, and further in view of Zogg; and Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zogg in view of Kawai.

As stated above the drawings are objected to. In response, the attached replacement sheets include Figures 5-9, prepared in accordance with the Examiner's requirements. For these reasons, it is requested that the objection to the drawing be withdrawn.

As stated above the specification is objected to because of informalities. In response, the specification is amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Therefore, it is requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

As stated above Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-17, 19, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Kawai. Claims 4, 7, 8, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Kawai, and further in view of Zogg. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zogg in view of Kawai. It is asserted that the amendment to the claims overcome the rejections for the following reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, the present invention is directed to a grounding plate of a photosensitive drum assembly used in an image forming apparatus.

Independent Claim 1 recites a plate member including a void configured to receive a grounding shaft. A drum contact member is configured to remove an electrically resistive coating from an interior of the drum. The drum contact member is connected to an outer periphery of the plate member. At least two shaft contact members are connected to an intermediate member, which is in turn connected to the outer periphery of the plate member. The shaft contact members are configured to contacts the grounding shaft, which is disposed between the shaft contact members.

It is submitted that none of Anderson, Kawai, and Zogg, disclose or render obvious the claimed features recited in independent Claim 1.

Anderson is directed to a ground plate for a photosensitive drum assembly. Anderson does not disclose or render obvious, however, the claimed features of at least two shaft contact members connected to an intermediate member, which is connected to an outer periphery of a plate member. Rather, as shown in Figures 1-7, for example, of Anderson, the spring contacts 19 and 37 are not connected through an intermediate member to an outer periphery of the ground plate 12.

Kawai is directed to installation of a photosensitive drum. Kawai does not disclose or render obvious, however, the claimed features of at least two shaft contact members connected to an intermediate member, which is connected to an outer periphery of a plate member. Rather, Figure 6 of Kawai does not show contacts connected to an outer periphery of a plate.

Zogg is directed to a conductive assembly for a drum in an image forming apparatus. Zogg does not disclose or render obvious, however, the claimed features of at least two shaft contact members connected to an intermediate member, which is connected to an outer periphery of a plate member. Rather, as shown in Figures 6-9, for example, of Zogg, the

tongue 70 is not connected through an intermediate member to an outer periphery of the grounding plate 68.

For these reasons, it is requested that the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claim 1 is requested.

Independent Claims 17 and 29 are allowable for reasons similar to those of independent Claim 1. Thus, it is requested that the rejections of independent Claims 17 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claims 17 and 29 is requested.

Further, Claims 2-16 and 18-28 are allowable for the same reasons as independent Claims 1 and 17 from which they depend, as well as for their own reasons. Therefore, the allowance of dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-28 is requested.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

22850


Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Steven P. Weihrouch
Registration No. 32,829
Attorney of Record

Lee L. Stepina
Registration No. 56,837

SPW/PH/me